DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 562 RC 009 896

AUTHOR Loughton, A. John
TITLE Indian Metis Project for Careers in Teacher Education (I.M.P.A.C.T.E.). An Internal Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Brandon Univ. (Manitoba).
PUB DATE Oct 74
NOTE 45p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Age Differences; *American Indians; Attitudes; *Canada Natives; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Cooperating Teachers; Curriculum; Dropouts; Eskimos; *Field Experience Programs; Graduates; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Sex Differences; Students; *Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Metis

ABSTRACT

Individual profiles (age, sex, marital status, number of dependents, type of withdrawal, academic success, center attended, educational background, and date of enrollment) were established for 87% of the 138 students enrolled in the Indian Metis Project for Careers in Teacher Education (IMPACTE) at Brandon University (Canada) between 1970 and 1974. Soliciting attitudes and opinions re: project format, courses, field experience, communication, role of the project personnel, and general project effectiveness, questionnaires were given to cooperating teachers, current students, graduates, and instructional staff. Personal interviews were also employed in the evaluation of IMPACTE. Some results were: almost 50% of the 1971 student recruits will graduate with teaching certificates; human service support for students should be increased; cooperating teachers, students, and graduates wanted a more vigorous approach to irresponsible student behavior; students wanted course instructors to spend 2 to 3 days a week in the rural centers and they very much wanted to help in the selection of courses; cooperating teachers wanted better, more systematic communication with the University and its faculty; students wanted methods instructors in their classes, faculty advisor visits weekly, a part in the decision making process, and more and better preparation for more extended field experiences. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED139562

INDIAN METIS PROJECT

FOR

CAREERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

(I. M. P. A. C. T. E.)

AN INTERNAL EVALUATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

A. John Loughton

Faculty of Education
Brandon University
Brandon, Manitoba

OCTOBER, 1974

RC009898

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data for this evaluation was collected and categorized with the help of researchers Iris Murphy and Phyllis Ashby. They both proved to be valuable assets in the completion of this task.

Nancy Hutton and the entire IMPACTE staff have been most helpful in assisting in whatever way we asked.

Also a special thank-you to Joyce Pashe for her excellent job in typing and preparing this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Project Description	1
2.	The Evaluation Methodology & Format	3
3.	The Students	4
4.	The Format	21
5.	The Programme	
	Courses	21
	Field Experience	26
6.	Communication	27
7.	The Staff	30
8.	The Graduates Recommend	35
9.	Some Generalized Observations	41

I.M.P.A.C.T.E. is a teacher education project designed to provide an opportunity for entrance to the teaching profession by native Canadians. Little needs to be said here about the gross under-representation of Indian and Metis people among the graduates of Canadian universities. The evidence is well documented in many places.

Equality of educational opportunity is only provided in a society which aggressively (often in the face of vigorous opposition) provides resources for minorities who have not yet been able to take advantage of the public education system. Examples of such resources are found in I.M.P.A.C.T.E. and include:

1. Financial, living and educational expenses
2. Tutorial assistance
3. Counselling Services
4. Course availability (e.g., off-campus)

This is not an evaluation which addresses itself to the question of whether or not I.M.P.A.C.T.E. should exist. The necessity and legitimacy of the existence of I.M.P.A.C.T.E. is beyond question when one considers:

1. Arguments based upon equality of educational opportunity.
2. The right to cross-cultural identity in our society.
3. The evidence that Native teachers are "significant others" to native school children and as such have a positive effect on the child's self concept.

The task of this evaluation is to examine the function of the project with a view to its improvement.

An Overview of the Project:

I.M.P.A.C.T.E. offers its students teacher education (elementary route) prescribed by Brandon University's Bachelor of Teaching program. The requirements and regulations are those that exist for all B.T. candidates at Brandon University. The I.M.P.A.C.T.E. student who succeeds at the normal rate will accomplish the requirements for a teaching certificate in Manitoba (60 credit hours normally done over a two-year period) in two and a half to three academic years.

Off-campus: Students participating in the off-campus sections of the project take the majority of their courses and their field experience in communities (often their home community) other than Brandon. Off-campus centres have been established at: The Pas; Ebb and Flow; Rossburn/Erickson; White Horse Plains; and Fort Alexander.* The off-campus program is in large part financially supported by the government of Manitoba.

On-campus: The on-campus section of the project takes place almost exclusively on the campus of Brandon University.

---

* NOTE: Fort Alexander is a unique experiment in Federal funding administered by the Band. It has not been included as a part of this evaluation.

Field experience in schools is done in co-operation with the Brandon School Division #40, and schools in Oak Lake, Rivers, and Forrest, Manitoba. The majority of these students are status Indians and are supported financially by the Government of Canada.

THE EVALUATION: Methodology

The Students

Individual profile information was collected on 87% of the 138 students who were enrolled as I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students between August 1970 and April 1974. The variables considered included: Age; Sex; Marital Status; Number of Dependents; Status/Non-status/Eskimo; Type of Withdrawal; Academic Success; Centre Attended; Educational Background at time of Recruitment; and Date of Enrollment. This data was then transcribed to I.B.M. cards and cross-tabulated.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were distributed to co-operating school personnel (90% return). The staff of the evaluation team then visited the schools and collected the questionnaires. Further, they conducted interviews with each person who had completed a questionnaire. Current students in the program were also questionnaired (60% return). Instructional staff

were questionnaired (66% return). Graduates of the program also responded to a questionnaire. The questionnaire attempted to collect information concerning attitudes and opinions regarding: Project format; courses; field experience; communication; role of the project personnel; and generalized project effectiveness.

Interviews

The evaluation staff conducted personal interviews with all of the co-operating personnel questionnaired. Further, interviews were conducted with a sample of the instructional personnel and the professional staff of the project.

An attempt was made to identify areas of consensus (via questionnaires and normative opinions) and to compare the opinions of students, co-operating teachers and faculty members on the program and a function of the project generally. The data of each centre was also analyzed separately.

All data used in this evaluation was collected from May 1, 1974 and August 16, 1974.

The Students

Individual profile information was collected describing the 132 students who enrolled in I.M.P.A.C.T.E. since 1970. This data should provide:

1. A description of the student body of the project.

2. Trends in recruitment visible over the first three years of the project.
3. A profile of the successful graduates of the project.*
4. A profile of the students who left the project without gaining teaching certificates.

Most tables illustrated in this section are expressed in terms of percentages. The population for each year is as follows:

1971	-	45 students
1972	-	27 students
1973	-	46 students
1974	-	14 students
TOTAL		132 students

Age

Most I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students are young people 25 years of age or less. In fact the recruitment process in 1973 attracted 89% of the new candidates from this age group. (See Table I)

---

* NOTE: Graduates are normally expressed as a percentage of the students recruited in 1971, the class that is fully eligible for graduation at the time of the evaluation.

** NOTE: The 1974 figures include only those students recruited to the White Horse Plains centre in January of 1974.

TABLE I

STUDENT'S AGE
(In Percentages)

Year of Enrollment	Under 20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-Over
1971	15.6	57.8	15.6	6.7	4.4	0.0	0.0
1972	22.2	51.9	14.8	7.4	0.0	3.7	0.0
1973	17.4	71.7	6.5	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTALS	18.2	57.6	12.9	7.6	3.0	0.8	0.0

It is interesting to note in an examination of the 1971 students that the initial graduates of the project indicate a slight over-representation of those students who are between 26 and 35 years of age. (Table II)

TABLE II

PROJECT GRADUATES BY AGE
(In Percentages)

1971 Students	Under 20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-Over
% Graduate	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	---
Total 1971 %	15.6	57.8	15.6	6.7	4.4	0.8	---

This age range produced approximately 22% of the student body in 1971 and 37.5% of the graduates.

An examination of the unsuccessful project leavers shows that the Under 20 age group is slightly over-represented (see Table III).

TABLE III

STUDENTS LEAVING PROJECT WITHOUT COMPLETING TEACHER CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS 1970-74 (In Percentages)

N = 132

	Under 20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-Over
% Drop-Outs	25.5	54.9	9.8	5.9	3.9	—	—
Total % of Students	18.2	57.6	12.9	7.6	3.0	0.8	—

Sex

Table IV shows that slightly more women than men have been recruited into the project. However, given the nature and history of elementary school teacher recruitment the 43% male recruitment figure is well above public school norms.

TABLE IV

SEX OF STUDENTS (By Percentages)

Year of Enrollment	Female	Male
1971	57.8	42.2
1972	51.9	48.1
1973	56.5	43.5
*1974	64.3	35.7
TOTALS 1970-74	56.8	43.2

Successful graduates of the project are almost perfectly representative with enrollment (See Table V) with regard to the sex of the student.

TABLE V

SEX OF PROJECT GRADUATES

(In Percentages)

	Male	Female
% of Graduates (1971)	43.8	56.3
Total % (1971) of Student Body	42.2	57.8

An examination of project drop-outs (Table VI) shows a slightly over-representation of women, which may be partially explained by the fact that twice as many women as men are less than 20 years of age.

TABLE VI

PROJECT DROP-OUTS BY SEX 1970-74

(In Percentages)

	Male	Female
% Drop-Outs	37.3	62.7
% of Total Student Body	43.2	56.8

Marital Status

Approximately one-half of the I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students are married. (See Table VII)

TABLE VII

MARITAL STATUS OF STUDENTS 1970-74

(By Percentage)

	Married	Single	Single With Dependents	Separated or Divorced
1971	53.3	40.0	2.2	4.4
1972	59.3	33.3	7.4	0.0
1973	32.6	47.8	17.4	2.2
1974*	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0
TOTALS	50.8	38.6	8.3	2.3

An examination of the students recruited in 1971 indicates that married students have a slightly better achievement record than single students. (Table VIII)

TABLE VIII

PROJECT GRADUATES BY MARITAL STATUS (1971)

(In Percentages)

	Married	Single	Single With Dependents	Separated or Divorced
% of Graduates	62.5	18.8	6.3	12.5
% of Student Body	53.3	40.0	2.2	4.4

Further, the single student appears to be a little more likely to drop out. It should be remembered that 98% of all single students are under 25 years of age.

TABLE IX

PROJECT DROP-OUTS BY MARITAL STATUS 1970-74

(By Percentages)

	Married	Single	Single With Dependents	Separated or Divorced
% of Drop-Outs	47.1	47.1	5.9	—
% of Total Student Body	50.8	38.6	8.3	2.3

It will be interesting to examine the performance of those students recruited during 1973 who are predominantly single and somewhat younger than the students of 1971 and 1972.

Dependents

Almost one-half of the IMPACTE students do not support dependents.

TABLE X

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS OF STUDENTS 1970-74

(In Percentages)

Number of Dependents	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
1971 Student Body	40.0	17.8	20.0	8.9	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7
1972 Student Body	48.1	22.2	18.5	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7
1973 Student Body	50.0	15.2	28.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0
1974 Student Body	28.6	7.1	35.7	14.3	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0
TOTALS 1970-74	43.9	16.7	24.2	6.8	3.8	0.8	0.8	3.0

It does not appear that the added responsibility of dependents has a retarding effect upon I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students. In fact, to the contrary, Table XI indicates that students with dependents are more likely to graduate than are those who do not have children.

TABLE XI

PROJECT GRADUATES AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN (1971)

(In Percentages)

Number of Children	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
% of Graduates (1971)	12.5	25.0	25.0	18.8	6.3	0.0	0.0	12.5
% of Total Student Body (1971)	40.0	17.8	20.0	8.9	6.7	0.8	0.8	6.7

Nor are people with dependents more likely to drop out.

TABLE XII

PROJECT DROP-OUTS AND DEPENDENTS 1970-74

(In Percentages)

Number of Dependents	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
% of Drop-Outs	49.0	15.7	25.5	2.0	3.9	—	2.0	2.0
% of Total Student Body	43.9	16.7	24.2	6.8	3.8	0.8	0.2	3.0

Status

Table XIII shows the distribution of students with regard to status/non-status/Eskimo categories.

TABLE XIII

STATUS OF STUDENTS 1970-74

(In Percentages)

	Treaty	Non-Treaty	Eskimo
1971	77.8	22.2	0.0
1972	44.4	51.9	3.7
1973	43.5	47.8	8.7
1974	0.0	100.0	0.0
TOTALS 1970-74	50.8	45.5	3.8

An examination of the project graduates reveals that Treaty/Non-Treaty figures are representative of the population of each type of student in the project.

TABLE XIV

PROJECT GRADUATES BY STATUS (1971 Recruits)

(In Percentages)

	Treaty	Non-Treaty
% of Project Graduates (1971)	81.3	18.8
% of Total Student Body (1971)	77.8	22.2

Project withdrawals provide figures which were disturbing to the evaluator at first glance. Table XV appears to indicate an over-representation of status students in project drop-outs.

TABLE XV

PROJECT DROP-OUTS BY STATUS (1970-74)

(In Percentages)

	Treaty	Non-Treaty
% of Students Dropped Out	66.7	33.3
% of Total Student Body	50.8	45.5

However, closer examination reveals several other variables exist which obviously affect this particular characteristic. The analysis of status students recruited during 1973 who dropped out shows an over-representation of young (under 20) female students, who were enrolled in the Brandon Centre. (See Table XVI).

TABLE XVI

PROJECT DROP-OUTS IN 1973

(In Percentages)

	% of Drop-Outs	% of Total 1973 Student Body
1. Students Under 20	33.3	17.4
2. Female Students	73.3	56.5
3. Status Indians	60.0	43.5
4. Brandon Centre Students	66.7	52.2

Withdrawal From the Project

There is a strong possibility that 40% of the students recruited to IMPACTE in 1971 will receive certificates that will allow them to teach in the province of Manitoba.

TABLE XVII

STUDENT WITHDRAWAL FROM PROJECT 1970-74

(In Percentages)

	Graduates	Withdrawals	Continuing In Project
1971	35.6	55.6	8.9
1972	7.4	40.7	48.1
1973	0.0	32.6	67.4
1974	0.0	7.1	92.9
TOTALS 1970-74	13.6	38.6	46.2

This is an outstanding accomplishment by both the students involved and the project that gave them the opportunity to change their lives.

An examination of the characteristics of these graduates supports much of the data cited above.

TABLE XVIII

PROJECT GRADUATES CHARACTERISTICS

(In Percentages)

	% of Graduates	% of Total Student Body
1. Students Under 25	61.1	75.8
2. Female Students	61.1	56.8
3. Married Students	66.7	50.8
4. Students Without Dependents	11.1	43.9
5. Attended Brandon Centre	77.8	45.5
6. Students Not High School Graduates	72.2	75.0

Academic Success

(Courses successfully completed as a percentage of total courses registered in)

I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students successfully complete about 2/3 of the courses in which they are registered.

TABLE XIX

STUDENTS' ACADEMIC SUCCESS 1970-74

(In Percentages)

Courses Successfully Completed	0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Students Recruited in 1971	22.2	6.7	4.4	15.6	51.1
Students Recruited in 1972	22.2	0.0	7.4	3.7	66.7
Students Recruited in 1973	8.7	2.2	4.3	10.9	73.9
TOTAL OF ALL STUDENTS	15.2	3.0	4.5	9.8	67.4

Table XX seems to indicate that variables other than academic problems lead to students dropping out of this kind of project.

TABLE XX

ACADEMIC SUCCESS OF PROJECT DROP-OUTS 1970-74

(In Percentages)

Courses Successfully Completed	0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Students Who Dropped Out	37.3	7.8	11.8	15.7	27.5
Total Student Body	15.2	3.0	4.5	9.8	67.4

It is somewhat disturbing to realize that over 1/4 of the students who dropped out were able to pass more than 80% of the courses for which they registered. Further, well over 40% of the students who drop out actually were passing the majority of the courses for which they registered.

Educational Background

Seventy-five percent of all I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students would not be elibible for entrance to university under normal high school graduation requirements.

TABLE XXI

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF STUDENTS 1971-74

(In Percentages)

	Some University	High School Graduate	Grade 11	Grade 10	Grade 9	Grade 8 or Less	Adult Upgrading
Students Registered During 1971	2.2	17.8	33.3	20.0	4.4	2.2	20.0
Students Registered During 1972	7.4	14.8	37.0	14.8	7.4	7.4	11.1
Students Registered During 1973	6.5	21.7	13.0	19.6	13.0	13.0	10.9
Students Registered During 1974	7.1	28.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	28.6	28.6
TOTALS 1971-74	5.3	19.7	23.5	16.7	8.3	9.8	15.9

Table XXII shows that high school graduates and those students that have some university experience are over-represented in I.M.P.A.C.T.E.'s graduates. However, of equal interest is the fact that the other over-represented category is the student that is the product of adult upgrading.

TABLE XXII

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF IMPACTE GRADUATES

RECRUITED IN 1971

(In Percentages)

Educational Background	Some University	High School Graduate	Grade 11	Grade 10	Grade 9	Grade 8 or Less	Adult Upgrading
Graduates Recruited in 1971	6.3	25.0	31.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	25.0
% of Total Student Body (1971)	2.2	17.8	33.3	20.0	4.4	2.2	20.0

Examining the project drop-out figures, we find that students with some university experience, those with less than Grade 8, and the products of adult upgrading are under-represented in the attrition rate.

TABLE XXIII

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF IMPACTE DROP-OUTS 1971-74

(In Percentages)

Educational Background	Some University	High School Graduate	Grade 11	Grade 10	Grade 9	Grade 8 or Less	Adult Upgrading
Students Who Dropped Out 1971-74	0.0	21.6	29.4	19.6	9.8	3.9	13.7
% of Total Student Body 1971-74	5.3	19.7	23.5	16.7	8.3	7.8	15.9

OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Students

1.1 While the average age of I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students is under 25, there is little handicap for persons who 1) are older; 2) have several dependents; 3) have little formal educational background. In fact, these older students with the heavier responsibilities have been more successful than their younger colleagues. The single most important factor in the success of students is commitment. Recruitment procedures should not discriminate in terms of sex, marital status, or number of dependents, educational background - but should try and predict the degree of commitment the potential student has toward teaching.

1.2 Almost half of the students recruited to the Project in 1971 on a more or less open admission policy will graduate with teaching certificates. This is certainly a preliminary indication of success.

1.3 I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students passed the majority of the courses in which they enrolled. This also applies to those who dropped out of the Project. Human service support for students (e.g., housing/life styles/etc.) should be increased. This may be done in two ways: 1) The

increase in the amount of man-hours allocated for human service counselling, or 2) the redefinition of the job description of the support staff now employed.

1.4 Co-operating teachers, current students, and graduates all recommend a more vigorous approach to irresponsible student behavior, (e.g., unprepared for field experience lessons, chronic attendance problems, etc.). This is not a "success at all costs project." If a student is making a reasonable effort - they should have the right to all the support services available. However, if that responsible effort is not in evidence then a student should face the consequences, and perhaps termination. Evidence given by students to support this contention includes:

1. The community criticism of irresponsible behavior reflects on the whole project and therefore the students of the project have the right to censor such behavior.
2. Project morale and individual morale suffers when students are convinced that both responsible and irresponsible behavior are treated alike.

Recommendation

A council should be elected representing the student body, the staff, and faculty, to consider cases of irresponsibility referred to it.

THE PROGRAM

The Courses

Course work required for teacher certification in the first two years of the Bachelor of Teaching program includes:

First Year:

1. A minimum of 21 credit hours in Arts/Science/Music/Physical Education and a maximum of 30 credit hours in these courses.
2. A maximum of 9 credit hours in Education.

Second Year: (Professional Year)

1. Language Arts Methods (6 credit hours)
2. Social Studies Methods (3 credit hours)
3. Math Methods (3 credit hours)
4. Science Methods (3 credit hours)
5. Elementary School: Structure & Curriculum (3 credit hours)
6. Educational Psychology (3 credit hours)
7. Field Experience (minimum of 8 weeks)
8. Education Elective (3 credit hours)
9. Education Elective (3 credit hours)

The I.M.P.A.C.T.E. Project offers this sixty (60) hour sequence to its students in a variety of ways, i.e., an

I.M.P.A.C.T.E. student does not necessarily do all the requirements noted above under year one before proceeding to the course work in his or her professional year. Rather, courses are scheduled from the 60 hours when they support the program; e.g., the 21 - 30 hours of Arts and Science courses are normally done over the full 2½ year period instead of all in the first year.

Course Sequence

The co-operating teachers of the project recommend strongly (through both questionnaire and interview) that students do more preparatory course work before entering the classroom. Further, teachers from all centres recommend that course work not be attempted while a student is doing the field experience phases of the project.

Faculty members, co-operating teachers, and students all agree that the Language Arts Methods course should be completed before they begin their classroom activities.

The majority of students strongly disagreed with the suggestion that all courses be taken in spring and summer sessions.

The students recommended strongly that course instructors spend two or three days a week in the centres if possible.

Students also recommend that they should have a vigorous input into the selection of courses to be offered in the various centres.

The Co-operating Teacher

The students of the project have a strong positive image of interpersonal relationships between the co-operating teachers and themselves. The co-operating teacher, though, has several concerns about the project. They include:

1. They are not systematically informed as to the function of the project in their off-campus centres. This communication should include:
    1. Course information
    2. Day-to-day potential contact with University personnel. NOTE: Where this was available to teachers, i.e., The Pas and Brandon, a much more positive attitude toward the project was indicated through interviews.
    3. Long range plans.
    4. Information regarding specific support services like counselling, tutoring, transportation, etc.
2. They are not in constant contact with faculty members. Faculty members must visit schools more often in the view of the co-operating teacher.
3. Students are not always well-prepared. This concern has two sections.

a) Preparation, that is - academic background, before teaching in the classroom. (A problem faced to some extent by all student teachers.)

b) Preparation concerning specific lesson delivery.

4. Students are not always reliable. Attendance continues to be a problem. This concern is compounded if communication and supervision is also marginal.

On the other hand, co-operating teachers feel:

1. A real readiness to continue to participate in the program.
2. Support for the assistance to the learning situation in their classroom given by I.M.P.A.C.T.E. students.
3. There is no question that the role of Mr. Reddy in The Pas, and Mrs. Ross and Mrs. Clark in Brandon in 1973-74 should be a requirement for the effective supervision of first year students.

Both students and project faculty members recommend that co-operating teachers be recruited as resource persons to support methods course instruction. The co-operating teachers response to the same item was somewhat neutral; perhaps this

is an indication of modesty or perhaps an indication of a minority feeling that school staffs are expected to contribute time, counselling, and effort with little outside assistance and recognition.

The Students and the Program

Student reactions to their role in the program include:

Students

1. They feel strongly that the students contribute to the instructional process of the classroom in which they participate.
2. They and their colleagues have the potential to become above average teachers.

The Students and Communication

1. Co-operating teachers should be familiar with I.M.P.A.C.T.E. counselling staff.
2. The students did not fully understand what was expected of them as student teachers in the I.M.P.A.C.T.E. Program.
3. Students would welcome the involvement of methods instructors in their classes during field experience.

4. Faculty advisors should visit at least once a week while students are in the schools.
5. Students should have a part in project decision-making.
6. Students felt that they were well-informed as to the goals of the I.M.P.A.C.T.E. Program.

FIELD EXPERIENCE FORMAT

Goals, Roles, and Expectations of School Experience

Both students and teachers expressed some dissatisfaction with their preparation for field experience. While the existing efforts of expectation workshops were warmly received, they were not extensive enough, nor were they offered in all centres. In fact, perhaps those centres that needed them the most were excluded. The Project staff must take the initiative here. Teacher education is their business 100%. Co-operating teachers participate both as a courtesy and out of professional responsibility. But the teachers' priorities are with the education of the children in their class. The onus for organizational support and communication rests totally and heavily upon the Project staff. It is their responsibility to support the co-operating personnel so that the teacher's major purpose, the instruction of the youngsters, does not become interrupted or suffer while they are participating in I.M.P.A.C.T.E.

An interesting area of non-consensus occurs between students off-campus and on-campus. Off-campus students agree that students should not try to do course work and field experience at the same time. However, on-campus students who have classes available in the evenings strongly disagree with this position.

Students feel that half-days is a good starting point for their field experience. Co-operating teachers disagree. Two factors seem relevant here. Centres where the three-phase design of field experience has been discussed and expectations established, found the half-day format acceptable. The design of specific supervision, that is in The Pas and in Brandon, for first year students seem to make this attack successful. Where specific people were not assigned to help supervise first year students' field experience, difficulties arose.

Teachers suggested that perhaps field experience could be postponed until the second year of the program.

PROJECT COMMUNICATION

Effective communication is crucial to the accomplishment of the Project's goals. Perhaps the history of the Project can be categorized into a survival phase and a development phase with the watershed between the two phases taking place in 1974.

In the survival phase, plans are often made in reaction to day-to-day needs. This is not to suggest that pre-planning was non-existent. Nor is it to say that such day-to-day reaction was necessarily bad. In fact, such flexibility was essential to the original function of the project. This flexibility must be maintained. However, experience allows the project personnel to do more and more pre-planning in anticipation of the problems as they have occurred in the past. Questionnaire responses have identified the problems associated with the survival phase. Some of these include:

A. The Co-operating Teacher/Principal/Superintendents

Teachers indicated that they need clear communication in the following areas:

1. Systematic Information - regarding the total program including the rationale and goals of the project; profiles and problems of people recruited into the project; support systems available both to the co-operating personnel and the students; sequence of course requirements and field experience; changes and events of specific centre in which they co-operate.

2. Resource Personnel:

a. Know the availability of persons who can help to support field activities (counsellors,

study skills personnel, and instructors).

b. When these people [in (a) above] are available.

c. How to reach the people [in (a) above].

d. Organize times to meet with such resource people personally early in the term.

3. Skills Workshops:

a. The role of the ideal type co-operating personnel.

b. Realistic expectations of students activities.

c. How best to use student and instructor help in the classroom.

d. In-service availability through the Project.

B. The Students

The students felt that while they had sufficient knowledge about the goals and the structure of the Project, they were not well-advised as to the role expectations while they were in schools. Any acceleration of Skills Workshops must include students (also several sessions should be planned with students only as a pre-field experience session).

C. The Instructors

The course instructors need systematic information

from project counsellors and study skills people. In return, they need to provide the same kind of information to these resource people. Perhaps the periodic inclusion of instructors in staff meetings would assist this function. Permanent full-time professors on the staff of I.M.P.A.C.T.E. is the only cure. They need to interpret and help to define the teacher education requirements for the project. In addition, a teacher educator should have the added responsibility to become an academic co-ordinator.

D. The Staff

Communication between counsellor, administration, and the instructors suffered during the 1973-74 academic year when the position of co-ordinator was not filled for a short period. The predominant use of sessional instructors also makes communication difficult.

The Director

The Director of the Project is the overall administrator responsible for the Project. The Director has been responsible for liaison with the University, schools, funding agencies, and the communities which off-campus centres serve. Somehow this gigantic task has been accomplished during the survival phase. The directors

of the Project at this point are to be complimented on the task achieved.

It is essential in a project of this nature that some administrative personnel have a feeling and view for the overall project. This is the most important function of the Director. The Director must use this view to support the overall administration and his several liaison functions. Further, the Directors in recent months had taken it upon themselves to involve more and more the Project staff in decision making and policy establishment. This is a first-class venture and should be encouraged and expanded.

The Co-ordinator

The Project Co-ordinator's major responsibility is for information dissemination and communication within the Project. The Co-ordinator must be an implementor - able to take plans and see them through to fruition. He/She does such specific things as establish meeting places, times, dates, and provide the information from such meetings to people that are concerned. Communication between the staff; staff/students; teachers/the staff; and instructors/staff are all a part of the Co-ordinator's responsibility. The importance of this position was made vitally clear when the Project attempted to function

without it being filled. Both Mr. Robertson and Mrs. King are to be complimented on their involvement as project Co-ordinators during the difficult formation stage of the Project.

Academic Co-ordinator

A University instructor should be appointed as an academic co-ordinator. This person's responsibility would include program design of the specific instructional processes and their delivery during the academic year. They would also act as a liaison between the instructors and the project staff.

Administrative Officer

A difficult and demanding position, the Administrative Officer needs to be part of every person. The one essential thing, it appears, is that she/he not be asked to be a policy maker while on the job. Policy regarding allowances, expenses, and other financial matters should be made so that in the day-to-day functioning, the Administrative Officer is allowed to follow guidelines that have been set down beforehand.

The Counsellors

Counselling for such a project is really more than

crisis intervention. A counsellor must be a human services co-ordinator of sorts. Because of this kind of responsibility the Counsellor's office is in dire need of manpower help. It is impossible for one person to attempt to provide the counselling and human services co-ordination that such a project needs. One Counsellor ought to be available at all times for off-campus service.

The Developmental Stage

This stage needs to provide the same function that the project so far provides with the following additions:

1. A systematic information system tying together the several parts of a successfully functioning project.
2. An instructional delivery system where the individual delivery of courses is part of an integrated and sequential pattern. Crucial here is a fact that students and instructors alike have maximum input to the optional areas of the program.
3. Off-campus equality. Off-campus centres must have as many advantages in the program function as they have disadvantages. That is, they must not suffer from the fact that they are off-campus

centres, in comparison to the on-campus program. A significant starting point for this is the appointment of full-time faculty members to such centres.

Students in off-campus centres sometimes suffer from a "mosaic-like" instructional process. This is due to a sequence of independent courses delivered by sessional instructors who visit the centre once a week and then disappear.

The continuity and informal contact between students and instructors, so vital to good learning, is therefore missing. It is recommended that each centre have a resident faculty member who teaches the majority of their courses on site. Their major functions might be to provide the continuity and informal contact mentioned above. Certainly they could also provide liaison with the schools and be an administrative co-ordinator for the centre.

4. A vigorous support service program to participating schools and co-operating personnel where the Project actively and aggressively attempts to provide services in support of the program.

THE GRADUATES RECOMMEND

The Program

1. On-campus and off-campus programs must provide essentially the same services. Off-campus students must not be discriminated against.
2. Students should be more involved with each other in every-day functions and social activities.
3. Students should be included in important decision-making changes within the project.
4. The graduates endorse heartily the flexibility of the program and appreciate its contribution to them.
5. They also endorse the choice of courses available to them.
6. They advise strongly against attempting to do courses and field experience at the same time.
7. They advise that perhaps it would be better to wait for a longer period of time before starting field experience.

The Students

The graduates observe:

1. That great care should be taken to ascertain whether a student is committed to teaching before they are admitted to the Project.

2. Perhaps a probationary period could be implemented where a student is evaluated on their work and attendance, etc.
3. Students who do not perform should not be pampered because their place could be filled by someone who is more committed.
4. There is a real appreciation for the availability of personal growth throughout the project.
5. Students ought to be rewarded for diligent work and responsible behavior.

I.M.P.A.C.T.E. Personnel

1. The graduates expressed a general satisfaction with the rapport that they had with the staff. They appreciate people who are approachable and complement the staff on maintaining this kind of atmosphere.
2. The graduates appreciate the native involvement in the administration in the project and they endorse the further recruitment of such persons.
3. The graduates criticize staff turnover and recommend that as much stability as possible be built into the staff positions in the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The Program

2.1 The amount of practical classroom experience in the program is not sufficient. Further, its distribution is somewhat inequal. The twelve week one-half day sessions in first year and eight week all-day sessions in the second year give the student the equivalent of fourteen weeks of field experience.

The minimum amount of field experience should be twenty weeks over the 2½ year period. This time should include supervised practicums in each of the methods courses.

There is little or no advantage to exposing students to the classroom without teaching skills or knowledge. Premature field experience can be less useful than none at all. Therefore, field experience of any short should not occur until after at least one full university semester (3½ months) has been completed. Then it should begin with heavy supportive supervision.

2.2 Whenever possible, courses should not be scheduled during field experience.

2.3 The first half of Language Arts should be done before the initial field experience segment.

2.4 Summer school options should be offered by the Project in response to questionnaires distributed to staff and students (both on and off campus) no later than January of the winter term preceding the summer of the preceding winter term.

2.5 If it is possible for on-campus students to complete certification requirements in 2 years, then off-campus students should have the same opportunity.

The Co-operating Teacher

3.1 The Project has a responsibility to its co-operating teachers to:

a) Provide complete and systematic information about the Project and its functions. Perhaps a monthly newsletter could accomplish this.

b) Recruit only those teachers who are committed to the ideals of the Project.

c) Provide workshops at the convenience of the co-operating personnel in:

1. Cross-cultural education.
2. Field experience expectations.
3. Project building.

4. Evaluation.
5. Such others as the teachers may identify.

3.2 The Project should initiate and support financially a council of the supervising teachers of the Project that can make recommendations to the Project on matters that concern them.

3.3 The co-operating teacher should have access to the resource personnel hired by the Project. The Project should aggressively advertise these resources and provide organization and financial support for workshops, etc.

3.4 Whenever possible a teaching centre should be established as part of Project activities. Teachers should be encouraged to use this facility. Release time should be available to teachers so that they can do this. (See paper by Hammond and Loughton for reference on Teaching Centres).

The Instructors

4.1 Faculty supervisors must visit each student a minimum of once a week during field experience.

4.2 Instructors should participate in Project staff meetings on a regular basis.

4.3 Staff circulars that provide vital day-to-day policy decisions should be given to instructors.

4.4 The instructors of the Project should have a council from which they can forward recommendations as to the instructional design and function of the Project.

4.5 An Academic Co-ordinator should be appointed immediately. This person should be a teacher educator who would assume a leadership role, (e.g., Chairman of the council recommended in 4.4 above), in instructional design and be a liaison with other faculties of the University.

4.6 Wherever possible, full-time instructors should not teach more than one course on a sessional basis. i.e., They should reside where they teach the majority of their course work.

4.7 Each off-campus centre should have at least one resident instructor.

4.8 Course evaluations should be completed by students on each course done. This may be done in two sections: a) on the instructor; b) on the course.

The instructor information should be forwarded directly to the instructor involved and the course information to the Instructor's Council.

GENERALIZED OBSERVATIONS

The Project has successfully established a structure that delivers the Bachelor of Teacher program to both on and off campus students. It is now entering a crucial stage of development where the Project personnel must aggressively pursue innovative techniques in program delivery if the Project is to reach the goals of an excellent teacher education program. The Project has, of course, already far surpassed regular teacher education programs in the human services support function for its students. It now remains for I.M.P.A.C.T.E. to do the same with its program design and delivery.